

LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of Labour Unity

Founded 1921

Editor : R. Palme Dutt

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| Playing With Fire | ★ R.P.D |
| Railway Finance and
Nationalisation | ★ J. R. Campbell |
| A Plan for Peace in Kenya | ★ D. N. Pritt, Q.C. |
| Rising Revolt Against
Adenauer | ★ Erich Meyer |
| Budget in Election Year | ★ Ronald Francis |
| Nehru and Communism | ★ Ajoy Ghosh |
| Social Structure of Britain | ★ Sancho Panza |
| Stalin's Legacy and Britain | ★ Wm. Gallacher |

March, 1955

One shilling and sixpence

NOT TO BE SILENCED



AFTER two years it is announced that the Labour Party has dropped the project of starting a weekly, on the distributive trade 'advising' that there is 'no more room' for it. When such a powerful body cannot get on the bookstalls, the small independent publisher has no chance at all, protested a correspondent to the *Manchester Guardian*, adding: 'This squeeze by the bookstalls and newsagents must have the effect of banning the expression of much of contemporary life.' For 'contemporary life' read what the British people think about the real problems affecting their lives, and you get yet another glimpse of what increasing monopoly stranglehold means for 'public opinion'. Break through for once the deafening silence and many public figures are genuinely startled at the unfamiliar accent of the people's voice. To some it brings vast encouragement; to others icy fears. Thus, despite pressing attentions of mounted police, when large numbers lobbied the House of Commons recently they brought cheering reassurance that he did *not* stand alone to any M.P., who openly or privately opposed German rearmament. Those M.P.'s who brazenly or covertly backed this American policy got timely warning how deep was their isolation from the people. The double-barrelled effect of that famous lobby will be felt for long, and increasingly.

Not a few LABOUR MONTHLY readers were amongst the lobbyists,

using arguments from our many articles with telling effect. Thus a *Surrey* reader asked us on the eve of the lobby to rush copies of the January L.M. to five neighbours (all active Labour Party members) with whom he was journeying to Westminster, 'because R.P.D.'s *Notes and Pollitt's* article are full of material just on the points we are discussing between ourselves'. Others too have told us how they hit the target that day with our ammunition. They stress especially the value of those articles which they could not have obtained elsewhere. Thus, as long ago as February, 1954, Jacques Duclos' *France Moves* foreshadowed the opposition there, seen again in Edouard Herriot's *The End of E.D.C.* and more recently in Arnold Zweig's *Letter to Mendes-France*. American readers especially were struck by this, which, comments a *New Yorker*, underlined 'the great disservice that French ex-premier has done to his country and to the rest of the world, by becoming a party to the war-breeding Paris pacts'. Another thought Zweig's letter important enough to send copies to six American progressives, believing 'they will use it as material for speeches'. Today Labour Party circles are startled and encouraged by immense opposition in West Germany itself, so vividly described on page 122. No L.M. readers were taken by surprise, for they had the advantage in September of reading the article by ex-Chancellor Dr. Josef Wirth. It was in L.M., too,

(Continued on page iii of cover)

Germany the torches of war are being kindled by the same statesmen who proclaim their only aim to be to impose peace by force of superior armed strength ('the enemy only respects strength'). And to crown the witches' sabbath, in case the application of the match to the gunpowder should lead to the explosion, all the Field Marshals and Defence White Papers are vociferously proclaiming the aim of thermo-nuclear war, irrespective of what the enemy does, as the official foundation of Western military strategy in any future major war — at the same time as the Western pacifists weep maudlin drunkard's tears over the prospect, without raising a bleat of protest against the decision to use such weapons, and even in the midst of their tears, protesting against any proposal to ban such weapons as a plot to rob Western civilisation of its dearest possession. To any sensible realist, all this playing with loaded guns (and what guns!), especially with nervous, quivering fingers on the trigger, constitutes an ugly and dangerous situation, which requires to be actively countered and reversed, before it develops into something worse.

Triple War Front

One of the peculiar features of this dangerous situation, differing from previous periods of high international tension centred on one main area or issue, is the multiple character of the present war offensive. This gives rise to the risk of confusion or dispersion of the efforts for peace, as the spotlight focusses now one and now another area of immediate disturbance and urgency, while the other fronts are pressed forward with relatively less attention. The American 'Second Front' in Asia draws off a portion of public attention from the drive for Nazi rearmament in Europe. Both become the cover for slipping through the ominous official N.A.T.O. decision for thermo-nuclear war, almost without major public discussion (plenty of discussion of the horrors of the hydrogen bomb, but little enough on the significance of the N.A.T.O. decision, which remains shrouded in formal secrecy, so that even the British Premier had to profess ignorance of the precise machinery which would put the dread decision into effect). This strategy of the war offensive can only be countered by a corresponding combined strategy for peace, which raises public awareness from the present sporadic anger or apprehension over one or another issue to a full and conscious recognition of the interlocking character of the various fronts of the war offensive. There are, in practice, three main fronts of the present war offensive.

Far Eastern Offensive

First, and in the forefront at the present moment in immediate urgency, is the American offensive in the Far East. The United States has concentrated the most massive combination of naval, military and air forces since the Korean war, and this time openly with atom bomb equipment, thousands of miles from American shores, in Chinese waters and on Chinese territory. This warlike concentration has been accompanied with such wide, ambiguous and provocative orders from the Administration to the commanders on the spot, and with such unconcealed aggressive threats to China (not merely if China acts to free Chinese territory, but also if China is deemed by the American commanders to be making any preparations for such action), as could easily give rise at any moment, out of any incident, to major war. This aggression is proclaimed to be justified on the grounds of American 'security.' The requirements of American 'security' — the old familiar argument of the aggressor — are alleged to override international law and the signed international commitments of the United States, recognising Formosa and the Pescadores as Chinese territory 'stolen' from China by Japan (and now by America), and to justify the armed occupation of these islands, thousands of miles from American shores, by American power in the name of American 'defence.' But if the argument of security were valid, it is obvious that the conclusion would be exactly the opposite. If the military occupation of these islands, thousands of miles away from the United States, is declared to be necessary for American 'security,' how much more are they necessary for Chinese security, when they are on the very doorstep of China, and their military occupation by hostile forces constitutes a pistol pointed at the heart of China. The aggressor is here clear and unmistakable; and peace requires, not the confirmation of the aggressor in the possession of his booty, but the withdrawal of the aggressor.

'American Possessions'

It may very well be that the American Administration hopes to get away with the fruits of aggression at the present moment without immediately opening major war with China, and thus establish the base for the openly proclaimed aim of future war to destroy the regime of the Chinese people's choice which the lords of Wall Street and the Pentagon (nice and fastidious judges of true democracy — witness Guatemala) refuse to recognise. Other

influential voices in military and Congress circles and in the Press demand instant action.

Senator Knowland and others think of the coastal islands in proprietary terms as though they were American possessions. . . .

One of the most extraordinary aspects of the Senate debate is the calmness with which some members discuss preventive 'strikes' against the Chinese mainland, if need be with atomic weapons.

(*The Times*, January 29, 1955.)

Senator Morse, in opposing the President's resolution, said that 'the United States was moving into the position of threatening an act of aggression before it was attacked.'

'It Could Mean War'

In an article under the title 'It Could Mean War,' Stewart Alsop warned that the decision of President Eisenhower, announced on January 24, constituted a new departure in United States policy, and a victory for Admiral Radford, representing the war party:

The extraordinary gravity of the decision which President Eisenhower has now taken is not yet fully appreciated in Congress or the country. The decision is essentially, to bomb the Chinese mainland if this is deemed necessary for the defence of the Nationalist-held islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Bombing the Chinese mainland means, of course, war with China. It could mean war with China's ally, Russia.

The Presidential decision to risk a major war in the defence of these two islands represents a great victory for Admiral Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Last October, Radford first proposed that the 7th Fleet should bomb the Chinese mainland, if necessary, to hold Quemoy. That time, Radford suffered a defeat, when President Eisenhower ruled against it.

Alsop records how Admiral Radford then won over Dulles to his viewpoint:

It was thus Dulles, rather than Radford, who went to the President and persuaded him to reverse his October ruling. . . .

The great central decision has been made. The decision to bomb the Chinese mainland, if necessary, may well be—it probably is the right decision. But the dangers it involves, including the dangers of war should be faced up to boldly.

(Stewart Alsop, 'It Could Mean War', *New York Herald-Tribune*, January 27, 1955.)

Classic Formula for War

The menace of this situation does not lie merely in the open aggressive plans of powerful military leaders in the United States, working in co-operation with Chiang, and their jingo press. The

full menace lies precisely in the combination of this war drive at high levels with the more complex 'compromise' strategy of President Eisenhower, which seeks to combine an element of bluff and bluster with heavy military mobilisation and threats to compel submission, and thus follows the classic formula which has so often in the past led to war, whatever the initial calculations of its instigators.

Gambling with War

President Eisenhower and those finally responsible for American policy have reason to be aware that a major war with China would be a hazardous enterprise for the United States. They have had an experience in Korea which has considerably sobered their previous illusions of American omnipotence. They know that in Korea the original calculation to use only naval and air superiority in order to win an easy victory for a puppet regime, while leaving the actual fighting to the subsidised forces of the puppet regime, soon gave way to the necessity to use American ground forces on an extending scale, with consequent unpopularity of the war, and to squeeze out all the troops they could from reluctant allies. They know that they could count on no allies (save puppets) for a war with China. They know that even the old rubber-stamp vote in the United Nations would be doubtful; and President Eisenhower went out of his way to make clear that any action would be undertaken by the United States without reference to the United Nations. These considerations have led to their obvious hope that the most overwhelming American military, naval and air mobilisation on the shores of China, combined with the most aggressive, provocative and vague threats, would suffice to intimidate the Chinese into submission to the aggression in order to avoid war, and thus secure the American aims without major war. This typical calculation of a bully only reveals the remoteness of the American ruling class outlook from understanding either the character or the strength of the Chinese popular regime. But the danger of this kind of gamble, with war as the stakes, is that, once the military concentration is massed on the spot, and the deliberate ambiguous threats of action are thrown out and passed on to the commanders on the spot, any incident can give rise to war; and the maniac puppet, Chiang, with powerful and vociferous supporters in the United States, is at hand to apply the lighted match.

'Cease-Fires' and 'Cease-Fires'

It is in pursuit of this dangerous and provocative strategy that President Eisenhower, after carrying out his military aggression and occupation of Chinese territory, has sought to cover up his tracks and confuse world opinion by demanding a 'cease-fire' of a peculiar kind, before direct military operations have begun (other than through his subordinate, Chiang), that is, a 'cease-fire' to confirm the aggressor in the possession of his fruits of aggression without further war. This is much as if a burglar, caught red-handed by the householder, were to propose a 'cease-fire,' that the householder should lay down his gun and leave the burglar in possession of his booty. After the experience of the imperialist wars of aggression against the Korean and Vietnam peoples, the rulers of America have had occasion to observe how the anger of world popular opinion against these unjust wars expressed itself in the demand for a cessation of hostilities and a cease-fire agreement in order to halt the aggression and give an opportunity to the peoples of these countries peacefully to establish their national freedom. With resentful memories of these experiences, where the cease-fire meant a check to their aggressive aims, they have now sought to play the clever parodist and confuse public opinion by presenting the same phrase to cover the opposite aim, not to halt and defeat their aggression, but to protect it. It is obvious that here the cause of peace requires the withdrawal of the aggressor, that is, of the foreign invading forces from Chinese territory, so that the Chinese can settle their affairs among themselves, without foreign intervention.

Britain's Responsibility

The extreme menace of the present position makes of vital importance the role of negotiation which other powers can play to assist a peaceful settlement. Nor can there be any question of Britain's special responsibility in this issue, as the proceedings of the Conference of Commonwealth Premiers emphasised. In the conversations of the British Ambassador in Moscow with the Soviet Foreign Minister on January 28 with regard to the dangerous Far Eastern situation, the report states that the Soviet Foreign Minister drew the attention of the British Ambassador to the fact that if Britain were not supporting the United States in her aggressive actions in this area, the United States would not have decided to undertake such actions.

A true bill, well worthy of the consideration of Mr. Eden, after his experience of fulfilling the same ignominious role of apologist

for the aggressor in relation to the Axis offensive on the Spanish Democratic Republic, and of the outcome of that policy. What could Britain do in the present situation? Two things immediately. First, to intimate to the United States that Britain will not support military action against China and in the interests of peace regards as imperative the withdrawal of American armed forces from Chinese waters and territory. Next, to co-operate with other powers concerned for peace, specifically with the Soviet Union and India, as proposed in the Soviet initiative of February 4, to convene a conference of the five great powers and the five Colombo powers in order to seek to reach a peaceful settlement.

Offensive in Europe

Second—but by no means second in importance, in view of the historic role of Europe in general, and Germany in particular, as the battleground of the powers and the breeding ground of world wars — the offensive in Europe. The criminal plan to rearm Nazi militarism continues to be pressed forward with all the greater tenacity and fury, the more the opposition mounts and makes itself visible among the majority of the people in every country in Europe, including in Germany. The strength of popular opposition has held up the plan for nearly five years since it was first publicly formulated by American policy in 1950 and forced on the reluctant British and French Governments. The popular opposition smashed after two years the E.D.C. form devised in 1952: it is now rising ever higher against the new revised plan of the London and Paris Agreements. Truly a Verdun of democracy and peace, expressing the determination of all the people of Europe that ‘they shall not pass’.

Europe’s Fate in the Balance

The collapse of Mendès-France carries its lessons. Last year he had reached no small height of prestige and popularity after the Geneva settlement, with the hope of a new independent role for France, reinforced by the defeat of E.D.C. Within so short a time after, he sank like the stick of a rocket as soon as he had capitulated to American and British pressure on Nazi rearmament, despised alike by the left and the right, and with France sliding back to the old subordinate position of a cipher in international politics. His fate demonstrates the fatal consequences of surrender on this issue. The Soviet proposals of January 15, for a united democratic Germany, not tied to any military ‘coalition, and with free elections

on the basis of the Eden plan, if desired (as subsequently made clear), removed the last pretext of the champions of Nazi rearmament. In the parliamentary labour party on February 9 the vote for the official policy, in this case in the form of refusing a four power conference on Germany before the completion of ratification, was carried by only 93 votes to 70; so that what had already in every vote always been a minority of the Labour M.P.'s supporting the official policy on Nazi rearmament had fallen to less than a third of the total. Above all, in Germany, the opposition, with the support of the entire organised labour movement, both in the West and in the East, and of the widest circles of democratic opinion, among the churches and among the youth, and even among the coalition parties of Adenauer's Government, rises to new heights and shakes the basis of Adenauer. But the offensive of militarist pro-American pro-Nazi reaction in Europe continues to be driven forward with every means of pressure at its command. In this battle the fate of Europe, no less than of future war, is at stake.

Thermo-Nuclear War

Third, and most serious of all in its long-term significance, is the official decision of the N.A.T.O. powers at their meeting in December on the eve of Christmas (what a Christmas gift to mankind!) to base their military strategy on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, irrespective of the action of the enemy, that is, to use such weapons first. The full significance of this decision needs to be emphasised, since every attempt has been made to blur and confuse it, both in the formalised wording of the official communiqué ('The Council considered a report by the Military Committee . . . taking into account modern developments in weapons and technique. It approved this report'), and in press treatment, in order to conceal the hideous import of this mass death-warrant from adequate realisation by public opinion.

Ten Years of Crime

The desire of the rulers of the Western Powers to use atomic and all other criminal weapons of mass destruction in a future major war is not in itself new. That was visible from the outset, from the dropping of the first atom bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, when the Anglo-American rulers dared not inform Stalin of the character of the bomb they proposed to drop, for fear he should veto it. They dropped those first fateful atom bombs which have poisoned the

post-war atmosphere, not in order to hasten the end of the war with Japan, since Japan was already offering to surrender, but as the first blows in their new 'cold war' to establish Anglo-American (in reality, American) world supremacy in the post-war era on the basis of an assumed atomic monopoly. Their true intentions were clear in those early post-war years when, in fact of the shocked conscience of mankind, they had to pretend to desire to ban such weapons, to sign collective resolutions in the United Nations in favour of their banning, and to manufacture every possible delaying pretext in order to oppose their banning in practice, until the time came when they judged they could drop the mask and come out openly in favour of such weapons as the indispensable armoury of the West. Their permanent calculations of atomic war have been most clear in the recent period when President Eisenhower in every statement on military planning emphasised the increasing importance of what the American war criminals delicately call 'unconventional weapons'. They were unconcealed when the American forces in Europe were equipped with atomic weapons, and the agreements for the new Nazi army explicitly provided that it should be equipped with atomic weapons. They were publicly proclaimed when Field-Marshal Montgomery declared on October 22 last year:

I want to make it absolutely clear that we at S.H.A.P.E. (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe) are basing all our operational planning on using atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons in our defence. With us it is no longer 'They may possibly be used'. It is very definitely 'They will be used if we are attacked'.

This declaration extended the proclaimed intention of the Western Powers to use atom bombs and atomic weapons so as to include also the use of hydrogen bombs.

'A Thermo-Nuclear Christmas'

What was new in the N.A.T.O. decision of December? A gigantic controversy had arisen, especially among the smaller European powers, and also in Britain and France, on the political responsibility for such a decision which could mean their extermination. Writing under the title 'A Thermo-Nuclear Christmas', C. L. Sulzberger reported in the *New York Times* of December 25 the atmosphere of alarm in Europe—ascribing it, of course, not to the American plans to use the hydrogen bomb, but to 'Communist propaganda' shamelessly opposing such a beneficent blessing:

For the first time at Christmas mankind is haunted by the fear that it may utterly destroy itself. . . . The gloomy idea is being encouraged by

Communist propaganda seeking to hamper further American arms experimentation. . . . This terrifying propaganda falls on fertile ground. Even Churchill is much obsessed with death in the form of a long cigar-shaped radio-active cloud capable of obliterating the entire United Kingdom. Mendès-France came within an ace, while he was in the United States, of proposing a moratorium on further thermo-nuclear explosions. . . . Forebodings of European intellectuals are being carefully stirred up. . . .

No sensible answers have yet been produced by our side.

This was the situation when the N.A.T.O. representatives met to receive the military report endorsing thermo-nuclear war, and to settle the question who was to have the responsibility for the dread decision to let loose destruction on mankind.

Whose Finger on the Trigger?

The decision of the N.A.T.O. Council was characteristic. The military report was endorsed. The entire military strategy, disposition of forces, and planning was to be based on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, as stated by Montgomery. Thermo-nuclear war was to be the chosen Western strategy, not as a threat to deter the other side from using such weapons, but irrespective of what the other side did, to come into operation in the event of any major war. The Western Powers, as Marshal Sir John Slessor subsequently explained in his broadcast popularising the Paris decision, plan to use atomic weapons and the hydrogen bomb, not in retaliation to their use by the other side, but *first*. This was the essential feature of the December decision.

We shall not hesitate to use the bomb (i.e. the hydrogen bomb)—if necessary, to be the first to use it if we are attacked.

(R.A.F. Marshal Sir John Slessor, broadcast, January 27, 1955.)

Of course it was only to be used in a war 'against aggression'; but when has any imperialist power ever gone to war except 'against aggression'? Even when imperialism sends its troops and warships and bombers thousands of miles across the seas to invade other people's countries and spread death and destruction among them (Kenya, Malaya, Korea), it has always been 'against aggression'. So that little qualification means exactly nothing. Its hypocrisy is the more blatant since the Western Powers in the United Nations have solidly opposed every Soviet proposal to establish an agreed definition of 'aggression'.

Fictitious Political Safeguard

But—and here comes the grand political safeguarding provision—while the entire military strategy and planning is to be based on the

use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the final political responsibility at the moment of the declaration of war for endorsing their use is to rest with the governments of the 14 Atlantic Pact countries or their representatives. A truly marvellous political safeguard. Military planning is not improvised in an hour; it is prepared over years; that is the purpose of the general staff at Fontainebleau. The moment war is declared, the planned strategy comes into effect; there is no other. If the planned strategy is based on thermo-nuclear war, as the N.A.T.O. powers have now decided, then in the moment of declaration of war that strategy comes into effect. The 'choice' of the political representatives of 14 countries is entirely fictitious. No wonder the Belgian representative, P. H. Spaak (Belgium had been one of the countries most anxiously expressing alarm), summed up the outcome:

The decisions of the N.A.T.O. Council give the military men exactly what they want. They asked for authorisation to prepare atomic war. They have got it.

Sir Winston Churchill Doesn't Know

An illuminating measure of the importance of this 'political control' was revealed on February 1 when the British Prime Minister had to admit that he had not the slightest knowledge what the machinery of this control would be. Sir Anthony Eden had stated in his report on December 22 that the political responsibility for launching an atomic attack would rest with the governments. The Labour M.P. Frank Beswick, was persistent in desiring to know what this meant concretely. The consequent enlightening interchange ensued:

Mr. BESWICK: It is difficult for us to accept the Foreign Secretary's assurance unless we know in general, at any rate, what the machinery is going to be.

Sir WINSTON CHURCHILL: I cannot add to the answer I have given.

Mr. BESWICK: Do you know yourself what the machinery is going to be?

Sir WINSTON CHURCHILL: I cannot pretend to know everything.

The British Prime Minister 'doesn't know' how the decision will be taken that may wipe Britain off the map. An encouraging thought for the inhabitants.

Enlightenment for Sir Winston

Sir Winston Churchill may profess not to know who will take the decision that may settle the fate of Britain. But the American

press correspondents are very certain that they know. An Associated Press message from Paris on December 18 stated that the N.A.T.O. Council's decision 'did not appear to bind the United States to consult with its allies'. The *New York Times* correspondent reported on December 20 that the Council members 'took it for granted that . . . the decision would be made by those powers possessing the new weapons and the air force to use them'—i.e., the United States. A *Chicago Tribune* message from Paris quoted the statement of a high-placed American spokesman, who said:

The United States does not intend to permit its hands to be tied regarding the use of atomic weapons.

The explosive is safe in the hands of the incendiary.

Soviet Warning Signal

If we add together these developments of the international situation in the recent period—the provocative aggression of the United States in Eastern Asia; the offensive to rearm Nazism in Europe; and the decision of the Western Powers to use atomic and hydrogen weapons—it is obvious that we are faced with a grave situation. It is against the background of this grave and even deteriorating international situation that the decisions of the Supreme Soviet on February 8, in respect of Soviet policy and organisation, allocation of resources and composition of the government, alongside the budgetary plan for the coming year, take on special significance, not only in relation to the requirements of internal development, but also in relation to the fight to protect peace and guard against the menace of a new war. Not, as the more stupid hostile commentators have tried to suggest, in the sense of a change of policy from the continuous and tireless campaigning for peace, easing of international tension, reduction of armaments and banning of weapons of mass destruction. On the contrary, this campaign has been further carried forward with all the greater intensity: witness, the proposals for a peace conference on Formosa, the press messages of Soviet leaders to the United States, or the explicit declarations of Premier Bulganin, Foreign Secretary Molotov and Marshal Zhukov on peaceful co-existence and international co-operation. But when, in face of the provocations of the Western Powers, it has become necessary to replace the annual reduction of Soviet armaments by an increase; to concert the collective defence preparations of the countries of socialism and democracy; and to remind the Western strategists that they have no monopoly or even priority in the development of the

hydrogen bomb: these steps constitute a very serious warning to the aggressive elements among the rulers of the Western Powers, and one to which they will do well to pay heed before it is too late. These steps express also a warning to the supporters of peace in all countries that the sands are running down in the hour-glass.

No Bolt from the Blue

These new steps come as no bolt from the blue. They are the outcome of the whole preceding development. It is only necessary to recall the events of 1954. The Soviet Union reduced its arms expenditure in 1954, on top of the reduction in 1953, to a level of 17.8 per cent. of its budget, compared with 23.9 per cent. in 1952 and 32.5 per cent. before the war. The Atlantic powers boasted that their arms expenditure by 1954 was nearly treble the level at the beginning of the Atlantic Pact in 1950; United States arms expenditure reached over 40 times the pre-war level in money values, and over two-thirds of the budget. The Soviet Union opened its first industrial atomic power station. The United States exploded its first hydrogen bomb in the Pacific. The Soviet Union and China co-operated with Britain and France to win peace in Vietnam, against the open obstruction and ill-will of the United States. The United States replied by organising the South-East Asia Military Pact. The Soviet Union invited the European powers to meet for collective security in Europe. The Western Powers replied by pressing forward the Nazi rearmament plan to partition Germany and Europe. In face of these, and many more provocative measures, realism made imperative collective defence and preparedness measures by the states of socialism and democracy. The Chinese-Soviet Agreement of August was followed by the Eight Powers Agreement of the European Collective Security Conference in December. The new Soviet budget, with the first still very slight increase in arms expenditure, has followed (still, less than one-fifth of the budget, and below the level of social services and cultural expenditure, which has been simultaneously increased). Up to the present, the 'arms race' has been a one-sided arms race of the Western Powers alone building up their colossal rearmament programmes, while the Soviet Union has reduced its armaments. Do the Western rulers want a real arms race now to begin?

A Changing World

The balance of the world is changing. India, the second largest state in Asia and the world, has moved to an increasingly active role

in the cause of peace, and has found common ground with China and with the Soviet Union, despite differences of social system, in the common aims of peace. The visit of Premier Nehru to China last year and the projected visit to the Soviet Union this year are significant landmarks. With India, and with the co-operation of India and China, all Asia moves. The Afro-Asian Conference is convened for April. The majority of mankind is rallying to the cause of peace. The imperialists are more and more revealed as a tiny minority, placing all their hopes in horror weapons, because they have no hopes in the support of people. No country is more affected by the development of these new trends in the world than Britain, with its close associations with India, alongside its alliance with the United States. The Commonwealth Premiers' Conference in February mirrored the choice that is opening out before Britain.

Commonwealth Premiers—Two Paths

Two separate communiqués sprang from the Commonwealth Premiers' Conference. One came from all the Premiers, including India, Pakistan and Ceylon. The other expressed the conclusions of the 'White' premiers alone—Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa (Swart deputising for Strydom) and Rhodesia—excluding India, Pakistan and Ceylon, and presented as the conclusions of 'regional' conferences for 'defence'. The two communiqués spoke two different languages. The first spoke of peace, the reduction of international tension, the peaceful settlement of differences, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The only reference to German rearmament was to state that the Premiers 'were informed' that the N.A.T.O. countries considered this essential. The second communiqué spoke the language of war: welcomed 'the overwhelming superiority of the Western Powers in nuclear weapons'; applauded West German rearmament; wholeheartedly supported the South-East Asia Military Pact 'not only to resist aggression, but also to strengthen internal security', with special reference to the war in Malaya; and underlined the primary importance of the military alliance with the United States. Two communiqués—two paths. How long can the rulers of Britain hope to straddle both, when the differences in concrete policy and the decisions in action to be taken become ever more open and acute? The unconcealed divisions over the South-East Asia Pact and over Formosa, over German rearmament and thermo-nuclear war, have already begun to show the parting of the ways.

Britain's Choice

For the British people the choice is indeed imperative and inescapable. Britain has the opportunity to move forward with India, with China, with the Soviet Union, with the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world for peace. Or to go down in the shackles of the United States military alliance, as the criminal hydrogen bomb base marked for destruction. To the aggressive leaders of the war camp, and their fanatic allies in Britain, the destruction of Britain may seem a small and worthwhile sacrifice in the higher strategy of the glorious cause of anti-socialism and American world domination. The N.A.T.O. military experts in Paris in December are reported to have calculated that 'Britain would be wiped out in 20 or 30 hours' (*Daily Herald*, January 7, 1955). In a letter to *The Times* on December 7, 1954, the Labour M.P., R. T. Paget, wrote:

The safety of this country must rest upon the fact that her destruction cannot materially injure and will certainly invoke the retaliation power of the Atlantic nations.

The majority of the British people may have other views on the best conditions for the safety of Britain. But it is necessary to act quickly. Our rulers are playing with fire. Let us put out the fire before it becomes a conflagration.

February 15, 1955.

R.P.D.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

INDIAN TRADE UNIONISM

The existence, life and growth of trade unions in India is of the most vital importance to the Indian workers. To fight against the oppression of foreign imperialists and our own capitalists, millowners and others, against miserable wages, long hours, terrible housing conditions, to fight against starvation of working-class families, Indian workers have just one means, and that is by organising their ranks, building strong united organisations of the working-class militant trade unions. Strong working-class organisations pursuing militant class policy will be able to compel the millowners and other oppressors to grant the demands of the workers.

From Manifesto on the Nagpur Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress, March, 1930.

RAILWAY FINANCE AND NATIONALISATION

J. R. CAMPBELL

THE crisis on the railways has raised the whole question of the administration of the nationalised industries, of the relation of the wages paid in them to those paid in private industries, and above all the questions of how and for whom the railways should be modernised. The Tories hint that this crisis shows that nationalisation is a failure, and the Labour Party keeps strangely quiet, because it cannot effectively reply to the Tories unless it admits the mistakes in its own nationalisation policy.

In the period before the nationalisation of the railways the Labour Party propagandists put forward two propositions which appeared similar and were in fact quite different. The first proposition was that given publicly owned railways as part of a publicly owned transport system and given the expenditure of adequate capital on modernisation it would be possible to provide better wages and in the *long run* lower fares than a privately owned transport system could do. The second proposition was that given nationalisation it would be possible *right away* to increase wages and keep fares at a low level immediately.

Now this second proposition was only practicable if interest on the Transport Stock, which the shareholders received in exchange for their holdings in the private companies, had been very much lower than that agreed upon or if it had been paid out of taxation and not out of the current revenue of the railways. The Labour Government expected the railways to perform an almost impossible task when it gave them the job of (1) contributing over £40 million per annum to British Transport stock, (2) keeping the rise in fares and freight charges below the general rise in retail or wholesale prices, (3) paying wages comparable with those that could be earned in manufacturing industry. Subsequent developments demonstrated only too clearly that it was utterly impossible to do these three things simultaneously.

In their evidence before the Court of Inquiry the National Union of Railwaymen and the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen claimed that the railways were subsidising other industries and the general public. They gave the following figures. The general level of wholesale prices was 223 per cent. above pre-war

while railway freight charges were only 153 per cent. above pre-war. Retail prices were 134 per cent. above pre-war while fares were 90 per cent. above pre-war. It may have been politically and socially advisable not to allow fares and freights to advance as much as prices in general, but having arrived at such a conclusion the consequences should have been faced. It was asking the impossible to expect the railways to forego revenue and yet meet the big interest burden on Transport Stock.

Even the first and more modest proposition advanced by Labour propagandists remained inoperative. That proposition was based on the assumption that there should be a massive modernisation of the railways. In fact the resources for comprehensive modernisation were withheld. In each of the crises with which the Labour Government was afflicted, there was a decision to cut down capital expenditure in the nationalised industries. When large-scale rearmament was adopted in 1950 the capital development plans were cut further. It is only now, seven years after nationalisation, that a large-scale plan of modernisation has been put forward. The Labour Party's policy of treating transport as a whole (except in respect to traders handling their own goods) was sabotaged by the Tory de-nationalisation of road transport. The failure of seven years of nationalisation to produce a radical improvement in the transport services, is due to the fact that both the Labour and the Tory governments pursued policies which virtually wrecked nationalisation.

What is to happen to the railways in the light of the Court of Inquiry's report, the recent wage award and the Transport Commission's recommendations on modernisation? The short-term problem is how the Transport Commission is to meet the recent increase in wages. The Commission expects the railways to provide around £40 million per annum to service the present British Transport stock. In fact the railways, on the basis of their present charges, will only be able to find £10 million per annum. There are, therefore, only two possibilities. The first is to increase fares and freight charges, and the second is for the Government to take British Transport stock over into the national debt and pay the interest out of taxation revenue. (A variant of this would be to reduce the rate of interest payable on Transport Stock.) This would enable the railways to carry on without yet another increase of fares and freight charges.

The Tory Government has, however, resolved on an increase in fares and freight charges. 'Not only must organisation and costs

be reviewed so as to increase efficiency, but fares and charges must be adjusted to produce the best level of revenue,' Mr. Butler told the House of Commons on February 3. We believe that while some freight charges might be increased an increase of fares should be resisted. The Government and its tame economists fear an increase in prices this year, greater than in 1953 or 1954. An increase in rail fares would certainly give a stimulus to any such trend. For reasons which will be apparent when we have dealt with the modernisation plan, we favour the Government taking the responsibility for meeting the charges on existing stock.

The modernisation plan presupposes an expenditure of approximately £1,200 million over 15 years. £210 million will be spent on improvements of the track and signalling; £345 million will be spent on replacing steam locomotives with electric or diesel locomotives; £285 million will be spent on the replacement of many of the existing passenger trains by 'multiple unit electric or diesel trains'; £365 million will be spent on 'remodelling the freight services'. This expenditure is expected to produce 'a net increase in railway revenues of £85 million a year'. Of this sum Mr. Butler says '£40 million will be required to meet the interest and capital charges on the amount to be borrowed. . . . Depreciation will require an extra £15 million owing to the higher value of the new assets. That leaves £30 million to make good the annual deficit which now faces the railways'. To have arrived at conclusions as to the net revenue that will result from the modernisation plan, the Transport Commission must have made some calculation as to the movements of wages over the 15 years of the plan. Whether it assumed that the average money wage would be more or less stationary or whether it assumed an increase, we do not know.

The modernisation plan presupposes that a greater volume of traffic will be handled by the same or by a smaller labour force. A greater volume of traffic per man employed will be handled. In these circumstances the railwaymen will unquestionably insist on higher wages on the basis of a normal working week. If the modernisation plan makes this possible that is all to the good. If it does not it had better be revised. As the plan will take 15 years or more to carry through there need not be mass redundancy as a whole if the rate of recruitment of new labour is reduced and if unnecessary overtime is cut out. There can, however, be redundancy in particular grades, especially locomotive grades, and signalmen and in the goods depots. There will be redundancy in higher grades,

alongside shortage of labour in lower paid grades. It is necessary, therefore to insist that no railwayman shall be downgraded or have his status or earnings reduced as a result of modernisation. If this means carrying more labour than is strictly necessary for a time, it will have to be done. The minimum conditions for a modernisation which will improve the conditions of the railwaymen and will provide better facilities for the travelling public must include the nationalisation of road transport on a more comprehensive basis than that of the Transport Act of 1947. The Tory policy of unrestricted competition between road and rail as envisaged by Mr. Butler would be a disastrous waste of resources. It would lead to the creation of excess capacity on the railways and on the roads alike and in the last analysis this waste would result in meaner working conditions and a poorer service to the public. An integrated transport system is necessary if the huge expenditure projected for roads and rails is to yield the best possible results.

The modernised transport system should be given a fresh start by transferring the interest charges for the old stock to the national debt. The alternative is to raise fares or press down wages and will not be tolerated by the railwaymen and the travelling public. In the world of private enterprise a firm undergoing re-organisation and raising new capital has frequently to reduce its capital obligations to the old shareholders. This would most certainly have had to happen if the railways had been left to private enterprise. If the Government is too tender-hearted to undertake this necessary operation on the railways the least it can do is to reduce the burden of interest that they have to carry by transferring it elsewhere. These changes can only be brought about if the rail unions, backed by the entire Labour movement, close all alternative ways now open to the Government, such as speed-up, more work for the same wages, mass dismissals, etc. Then nationalisation will have a chance to show its superiority in solving Britain's transport problems.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; \$3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada (\$3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription 54s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 5s.; a year's subscription 60s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free, 4s. per copy; a year's subscription 48s.

A PLAN FOR PEACE IN KENYA

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

KENYA today presents not an insoluble problem, but a problem which no-one is genuinely attempting to solve. So far as the Government, the Army, the Police Forces and the settlers (if not the whole 'White' community) are concerned, a position of deadlock seems to be accepted as inevitable and incurable. They carry on a war which they cannot win other than by the complete extermination of the African population, which would be too costly, too long drawn-out, and too dangerous for their position in other territories of Africa. But they do not know how to end it. Some often try to behave like Bismarck, but they forget that even he, lover of bayonets, knew that one could do anything with bayonets except sit on them.

What goes to create the *impasse*? To begin with, there is among the settlers and many other Whites an absolute 'White supremacy' attitude that goes far beyond mere colour bar. The settlers—so-called because they settle on the land, and not because they ever showed any disposition to any other kind of settlement—number a little over 3,000, say, with their families, 10,000. I cannot describe them more accurately than by quoting Mr. Cyril Dunn in the *Observer*: he wrote that 'among the settlers there are decent honest folk'. I agree with him.

For the settlers, and for a good many more of the small white population, but by no means for all of it, it is axiomatic that the African is, and should be, an inferior being; that he has no right to good land to cultivate, nor facilities to improve his cultivation, or to buy and use for himself the machinery which—when he works for starvation wages on 'white' farms in the White Highlands—he learns to use very well; that he should be barred from cultivating certain crops, and paid much less than Whites for other cash crops which he is permitted to grow. And when all these restrictions produce the inevitable result of poverty and apparent backwardness of the African, he is chided for it. And the White idea of wages for Africans who are driven by land-hunger to work for wages, is that by 1960 the wages should go up to a point where they will be adequate for a man and his wife, but not for his children. Following the publication of the *Report of the Committee on African Wages* (Carpenter Report), the Kenya Government decided to achieve with-

in five years an 'adult' wage sufficient for a man and his wife. It rejected the Committee's recommendation that a 'family' wage should include sufficient for a man, wife and two children on the ground that it 'would place too great a strain on the country's economy'. That is, in effect, an official declaration that all Africans who work for wages, and their families, should starve now, and for five years to come, but that thereafter not they but only their children should starve!

Over against that attitude comes the point of view of the Africans, who outnumber the settlers and their families by at least five hundred to one. None of them—until well on into the 'Emergency', now nearly two and a half years old—demanded that the Whites should leave Kenya at present. They ask for much less. They want a greater share in the government of their country. They want more land. They want better land, particularly in the White Highlands, those lovely fertile uplands lying in an ideal climate, on which hundreds of thousands of them work, at wages officially declared (as shown above) to be starvation wages, to grow and reap crops for the settlers, whose absolute refusal ever to let any African cultivate such lands for himself has just been expressly under-written by Mr. Lennox-Boyd, who has graduated from being chief supporter of Franco to become Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies. (And do not forget that over half these White Highlands are and have been for years lying *uncultivated*, waiting for White immigrants who may come some time.) The Africans want, too, machinery and loans to enable them to cultivate more fruitfully the lands they have and the better land the return of which they are demanding. They want freedom to grow all crops, and to be paid equally with the White for their cash crops. They want better education. And, for those who are not cultivators, they want opportunities to work in higher and better-paid posts than those to which they are now restricted, and a living wage for less-skilled workers.

Faced with these modest demands of the Africans, and with a body of settlers able to dominate the Government to a substantial extent, and endowed with an inflexibility and a political outlook which might have shocked even George III and Lord North, an explosion was bound to come. When it came, it presented the Whites and their Government with the problem which always confronts those whose colonialist behaviour provokes explosions. What were they to do? There were not many choices. Negotiate? Make concessions? Start a war?

The Government chose the last. For two and a half years it has been making war, the most savage and brutal war even in colonial records, in which there seems little prospect of victory for either side, for it is nearly always impossible to defeat men who are fighting in and for their own land. Much more serious, it is clear that a 'White' victory, if it could be won, would put any true solution, that is, any remedy for the grievances of the Africans, further off than ever. There would be a restoration of what one might call the '*instabilitas quo*', with the only question: when would the war start up again?

The attitude of the settlers is still, in the main, the same as it was at the outset. Whilst some settlers, tired of the war, would like to sell their farms and leave Kenya, the bulk of them are still determined to fight on to an inconclusive victory, largely at the expense of the British tax-payer, and at an incalculable loss to everyone in human and material values. The Government itself has gone no further in attempts to find a solution than to announce terms for surrender which are a complete farce, and which are generally regarded as a mere cover for an amnesty offer to the security forces who have committed atrocities against Africans.

This unsatisfactory position has developed in the last two or three months into a greater crisis. Torture of prisoners to extract evidence and other atrocities have either increased or been increasingly exposed. Colonel Young, the Commissioner of Police—who can be taken, from a long training in the Metropolitan Police, and wide experience in organising the police in Malaya, to be not particularly 'soft'—has resigned, and his resignation is officially stated to be due to dissatisfaction with abuses by the Government forces. The conduct of these forces has also been strongly condemned by Mr. Justice Holmes, of the Supreme Court of Kenya, whom a long period of service as judge and procurator-general in Egypt may equally acquit of undue fussiness.

More strikingly, more and more of the non-settler sections of the 'Whites' are becoming dissatisfied with the policy of the Government and of the settlers; and a certain number of the settlers want to cut their losses and leave the Colony. More important still, the Christian Churches have shown their indignation at the conduct of the fighting, and of the Government generally. The Moderator of the Church of Scotland in Kenya preached a very strong sermon on the matter on January 9, and the Church Missionary Society has published a strong pamphlet on the same lines. Governments in

Kenya and other colonies have so long relied on the Christian Churches as part of the apparatus of 'law and order' that this criticism from the Churches is of the greatest value and importance.

The position today is thus one of growing hopelessness for the present policies, growing division among the Whites, and growing uneasiness and sense of shame in Britain itself. But it is not yet one in which the Government of Kenya, still less that of Britain, shows any sign of a desire to seek any real solution, or to defy the settlers; and the Americans are apparently offering financial help to the Kenya Government.

In such a position, the British people owe it to themselves and to common humanity—and even those who want any Whites at all to remain in Kenya owe it to their own desires and interests—to insist on a solution being reached. How does one find solutions? Outside Pentagons and mental hospitals, the method of negotiation is commonly used. So let there be at once negotiations for a cease-fire, an amnesty for the resistance fighters and political prisoners, and a settlement of the just demands of the Africans. Let the Government be shown that it must not accept dictation from the settlers, who will attempt to resist such a solution. Settlers can no longer, in this epoch, be financed in a war to deny to Africans all the basic human rights to which Africans are as much entitled as anyone else. This is not only because such a war is bound to fail, and to drag the settlers into the sea with it, but because to fight for such things is an affront to human dignity which we will not tolerate.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS IN 1955

JANUARY: *Murder Will Out*, R.P.D.; *How Labour Can Win*, Harry Pollitt; *Making the Poor Keep the Poor*, Katherine Hood; *My Six Hundred Million Friends*, John Horner; *Empire Premiers Meet*, Idris Cox; *Coloured-Barred*, A Nigerian in Yorkshire; *Letter to Mendès-France*, Arnold Zweig; *Churchill's Self Portrait*, Pat Sloan. BOOK REVIEW: *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti* (H. Fast); reviewed by P. Bolsover.

FEBRUARY: *War or Peace in 1955?* R. Page Arnot; *British Political Situation*, John Gollan; *Europe at the Crossroads*, Questor; *Nehru and Indian Communism*, Ajay Ghosh; *The Commonweal*, Wm. Morris; *Depression, Slide or Recession in America*, Sancho Panza; *Friends in Telengana*, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; *The Spirit of Liberty*, Reginald Bridgeman. BOOK REVIEWS: *Democracy and the Labour Movement* (Essays, editor J. Saville); *A Thousand Lives* (Iris Morley); *The Man Who Never Died* (Barrie Stavis); *Africa, Africa!* (Derek Kartun); *Science and Our Future* (Roy Innes); *Man and the Vertebrates* (A. S. Romer); reviewed by W. Gallacher, V. G. Kiernan, G. Hardy, R. Millner, T.A., D.R.N.

Drawings of China

by Marion Jeffares



Working girls at an



roidery Co-operative near Peking, 1954.

RISING REVOLT AGAINST ADENAUER

ERICH MEYER

THERE is an old German fairy story about a man who went out into the world to learn to be frightened. Adenauer didn't have to go out into the world—he learnt to be frightened in Bonn, his own 'capital'. Bonn is becoming more and more a centre of the West German police force. Ever new reinforcements are being concentrated there, and veritable manoeuvres are held in its streets. West German trade unionists in many places have decided to stage a 'March on Bonn' if the Bonn Federal Parliament continues the reading of the Paris Agreements. Slogans such as this are rousing the trade union movement and the determination to hold such a mighty demonstration against rearmament and for reunification is increasingly gaining ground. This is what frightens the Bonn rulers, and is why they are making preparations as though they had a civil war on their doorstep.

The Adenauer Government's fear of the people showed itself very clearly during the 24-hour strike of the miners and metal workers. As one man, eight hundred and forty thousand workers repulsed the insolent provocation of trust magnate Reusch, formerly Hitler's *Wehrwirtschaftsfuehrer* (Leader of Defence Economy), who challenged their 'co-determination rights' (the system of partial control by the unions in the coal and steel industries). The workers recognised in these 'personal views of an individual' (as Adenauer described the incident in an attempt to softpedal the whole thing) the signal of the monopolists and militarists for an offensive on their rights. They realise that the elimination of their right to combine and to strike is closely linked with the establishment of militarism, since total war demands the total rule of the militarists. Militarism demands all power in the state and does not suffer any other power to exist. These strikes consolidated and strengthened the authority of the trade unions in Western Germany, simultaneously demonstrating how isolated from the people are the Bonn politicians and those behind them. The trade unions owe this increased authority to the consistent anti-militarist and anti-fascist policy laid down in the decisions of the Third Congress of the D.G.B., the German Federation of Trades Unions.

This was the first time that a Trade Union Congress in Western Germany openly came out against the policy of the Adenauer Government. Though Walter Freitag, chairman of the D.G.B., defended rearmament, and Federal President Heuss personally tried to calm the waves, the 'Resolution against a Defence Contribution' was adopted by 390 to four votes. This resolution declares that the decisions of the London Conference, preparing for the inclusion of Western Germany in a system of alliances of power politics, are now to be completed by ratification. This, it goes on, would constitute a serious threat to a relaxation of international tensions and contradictions, as well as to any possibilities for the reunification of Germany. With regard to the internal development in West Germany, the trade unionists saw in this policy

the danger of creating a militarist authoritarian state which would spell the end of the efforts of the German working class movement for the establishment of political, social and economic democracy.

Finally the resolution states:

Congress rejects any defence contribution before all possibilities of negotiation to bring about an understanding among nations are fully exhausted, and before the unity of Germany has been re-established.

Such clear statements and far-reaching conclusions had previously only come from the Communist Party of Germany which, in its exposure of Adenauer's war policy, has always been in the vanguard. This development gave the West German militarists a big fright.

The working class, on the other hand, was fired by these decisions since they corresponded to the demands of the workers in industry who, during the preparations for the T.U.C. (for example, in the election of delegates) had already called for just such decisions and in many places had mandated their delegates accordingly. That is why D.G.B. Chairman Freitag and Federal President Heuss tried in vain to get something different from the delegates. *Welt der Arbeit*, organ of the D.G.B., plainly disregards its highest authority, the federal T.U.C., and continues to engage in propaganda for remilitarisation. The workers, however, immediately began to translate the decisions of congress into action. The Solingen federation gave the lead by deciding on the 'March on Bonn'; in Remscheid, trade unionists are calling for token strikes on the day on which the Paris Agreements get their second reading in Parliament. After that, it was the turn of the Solingen young workers: the youth of West Germany are organising a protest march to Bonn on the Sunday preceding the second reading in Parliament. The Bavarian district of the D.G.B. is organising a ballot for the demand of a

Referendum—still possible under the constitutions of several *Laender* though no longer provided for in the Bonn Basic Law (Constitution). In accordance with another decision of the D.G.B., its Dusseldorf Committee called for the prevention of a rally of the parachute fighters ‘Green Hunters’ and a meeting of the followers of Hitler general Ramcke was broken up. Because of these and other similar actions, at the moment things have become quiet round the ‘traditional rallies’ of S.S. units, the Steel Helmet organisation and the various *Wehrmacht* formations which on an average had been holding a rally a day. The trade unionists are not to be further provoked!

The Bonn gentlemen are trying to use the judiciary against the working class. Following the 24-hour strike of miners and metal workers the Federal Labour Court ruled—in contradiction to the right to strike guaranteed by the Bonn Constitution—that in the future employers will have the right to sack without notice workers who strike. This only makes the workers more determined in their resistance, because it confirms their belief that the trial to outlaw the Communist Party is a major offensive on all working-class organisations and would end in the workers being completely stripped of all rights. It is, therefore, not surprising that provincial delegate conferences, local federations, conferences of factory councils and functionaries of the D.G.B. continue to adopt militant decisions.

To the horror of Bonn politicians, even officials and members of the Christian Democratic Union are turning away from Adenauer’s policy. When several faithful disciples of Adenauer, with the assistance of the Catholic Workers’ Movement, tried to incite their adherents against the D.G.B. under the slogan *Quo Vadis, D.G.B.?* the real feelings of the Christian workers were unmistakably revealed. At a meeting called in Dusseldorf to intimidate the trade union leadership and to underline the threat of a split in the trade union movement, one of their own most prominent representatives in the D.G.B., trade union secretary Classen of the Catholic Workers, turned the tables on them and asked *Quo Vadis, C.D.U.?* warning that they were well on the way to repeating the mistakes of 1933 and stating that the policy of the D.G.B. was an effective answer.

Shortly before this, the result of a poll among Christian Democrats, organised by a foreign newspaper, had become known: 50 per cent. even in Adenauer’s own party are against re-militarisation. But the Bonn militarists were still more alarmed by the echo which

the rally in the historic St. Paul's Church of Frankfurt found in the German people. Trade unionists and party politicians, protestant and catholic theologians and professors raised their voice against the Bonn policy. Their words were heard by all sections of our people, and met with a ready response everywhere. True, the manifestation of the St. Paul's Church circle might have been even more effective without the anti-Communist remarks of two of the speakers, and had there been representatives from the German Democratic Republic. This would have transformed the rally in St. Paul's Church into an all-German demonstration against rearmament, at which the organisers, regardless of what divides them, could have reached agreement on the main issue of Germany's future. But despite this the effect of the rally is undeniable. In the constituencies of Dortmund, Herford, Aschaffenburg and Hof the collection of signatures to the 'German Manifesto' launched from St. Paul's Church has already begun. This Manifesto calls for resistance to the 'final tearing apart of our nation'. It opposes ratification of the Paris Agreements and calls for a policy which will ensure Germany's reunification and the peaceful co-existence of European nations. According to preliminary reports, more than 80 per cent. of the electorate are signing these demands of the Manifesto. In Hamburg 84 per cent. signed, while in Flotow, with its large proportion of middle-class people, the signatories amounted to 73 per cent. of the electorate.

At the St. Paul's Church meeting Dr. Gustav Heinemann, former Christian Democrat West German Minister of the Interior, in particular hit the nail on the head when he said: 'The prevailing world outlook in West Germany is: Make as much money as possible, have soldiers to defend it and churches to bless it'. These words are quoted over and over again in conversations. People are also much interested in the figures on the cost of remilitarisation given by Georg Reuter, deputy chairman of the D.G.B. The huge sum of 84,000 million marks will be required over the next three years for this item (the entire Bonn State Budget amounts to 26,800 million). Now the people of West Germany know what the rising prices are due to, that it is the 'policy of strength' that takes the worker's butter from his bread. New wages struggles, a further growth of the people's movement against remilitarisation, these are the consequences, and their effect reaches into Parliament, right into the Government coalition.

Adenauer, who thought he had a safe majority in Parliament,

now has to face the fact that his partners in the coalition, the Free Democratic Party and the Refugee Party, are asking for a postponement of the third reading of the Paris Agreements, as is the Social Democratic Party. While in the Federal Parliament the Christian Democratic Union commands a small majority even without its partners, the call of the people is audible even in its ranks and there are some who thoughtfully shake their heads: 'How is this going to end—can I vote for it?' They are asked ceaselessly, by letter, petition, delegations, to reject ratification. That is why Adenauer wants to make haste, wants to steam-roller ratification through parliament tomorrow, because the day after it may already be too late.

The extra-parliamentary fight waged by many organisations, but above all by the trade unions, the Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party, is now being opposed by Adenauer with a spate of C.D.U. meetings. This campaign was opened on February 8 in Frankfurt with a meeting at which Adenauer himself spoke. The meeting gave rise to such a mighty counter-demonstration that the Bonn politicians had to bring out not only their riot squads but their mounted police and water hoses in order to assure the Federal Chancellor a hearing. About a hundred arrests were made. Adenauer had planned to dictate militarisation with the help of Parliament, disregarding the will of the people. But the people demand more and more insistently to be heard.

At the Congress of the Communist Party of Germany it was stated that the resistance of the masses against West German remilitarisation would grow speedily because it was contrary to the interests of the German nation. This statement is confirmed by events every day. It was also stated that the Soviet proposals for a solution of the German question and the creation of a system of European security are the only path to the reunification of Germany and to peace. This is the basis for the slogan 'Reunification instead of remilitarisation'. The German nation is not willing to see its chances ruined. On this question trade unionists, Christians, Social Democrats and Communists are in complete agreement. The Communist Party says that if all those who oppose the Paris Agreements join in united action there can be no remilitarisation of Western Germany. Instead, there could be, this year, all-German free elections to a German National Assembly which from its ranks could elect an all-German government.

BUDGET IN ELECTION YEAR

RONALD FRANCIS

AS Budget Day draws near, the financial press, the Bank Chairmen and the powerful Federation of British Industries begin as usual to clamour for changes in taxation to suit the dominant clique of high-financiers and industrial monopolists, changes which are intended still further to increase capital's share of the national income at the expense of labour. They have been skilfully served in the past by the Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer, even though the niceties of the situation, where the Tories came to power on a minority of votes, have made it impossible for him to win for his class all the financial advantages that they demand. There was no need for the Tory Government to make a sharp break with the economic policies of right-wing Labour. None the less economic policy has been transformed under the Tories into a class weapon of far greater power. What was begun under the Labour Government has been taken over and pushed to its logical conclusion by the Tories. Rationing and price control has been abolished; direct controls over private building and capital investment generally have mostly been dismantled and hire purchase restrictions have been relaxed. In the sphere of international trade and finance the Tories have re-opened the commodity markets in Liverpool and the City of London, whittled away the direct control on imports and on foreign exchange, and are doing away with government bulk purchase of imported food and materials.

Theirs is the cyclist's boast—'Look, no hands'. In reality the abolition of the ration book and physical controls was the necessary basis for rationing by the purse and financial control—those centre-pieces of Tory 'freedom'. Budgetary policy and manipulation of the monetary system are methods of control which put an economic livelihood in the hands of the bankers. The object of Tory economic policy is to increase the power of British finance capital at home and abroad. Tory budgets have played an important role in bringing about the conditions necessary for money to be restored as the governing element in the economy. The food shortage was 'solved' by cutting down subsidies and allowing prices to rise freely. The housing shortage is being dealt with along similar lines. The ever-rising bill for armaments has been met by savings on subsidies and

by economising on education, the health service and the old age pensioners. Yet so great has been the increase in revenue from income tax, purchase tax, and the taxes on beer and tobacco that the Tories have been able to lighten the tax burden on profits and to grant special tax allowances for capital investment by businesses.

‘Conservative freedom’, says the Tory Central Office, has brought prosperity and full employment. There is no space to deal with this piece of deceit except to say that the current boom owes very little to Tory statesmanship. Indeed the present state of affairs with as many as 98 jobs for every 100 seeking work goes strictly against good Tory principles. What is more to the point is that, according to estimates of the *London and Cambridge Economic Service*, total Budget expenditure under Tory-Labour governments since 1948 has increased 33 per cent. while military expenditure alone has swollen by more than 50 per cent. (These figures are in terms of volume corrected for the rise in prices.) On the same basis capital investment has risen 28 per cent., but the total volume of consumption by the population has risen by only a meagre 10 per cent. during the six years. Military expenditure is the cuckoo in the Budget and is eating us out of house and home. On the Government’s own showing, in the *Economic Survey for 1954*, over half the increase in gross material output between 1950 and 1953 was squandered on re-armament.

The benefits of ‘Conservative freedom’ were admirably illustrated by a junior Minister in the House of Commons on January 27. In reply to a question, Mr. Maudling stated that between December, 1953, and December, 1954, the following increases took place:—

Retail Prices	+ 4%
Wage Rates	+ 4%
Company Profits	+ 11%
Dividends	+ 18%
Share Prices	+ 34%

As a Labour M.P. was quick to remark, this means that last year wage rates and prices rose by the same amount. Profits rose twice as much, dividends four times as much, and share prices eight times as much. If a ‘nil’ for old age pensions is added to the table you have a fair picture of Tory ‘prosperity’ in 1954.

Mr. Butler is now in something of a dilemma. He is naturally sympathetic to the F.B.I.’s request for cuts in income tax, surtax,

profits tax (particularly on dividends, says the F.B.I.) and for increased investment allowances. But with a General Election expected this year something must be found in the Budget to wheedle votes out of that nine-tenths of the population whose interests tend to be overlooked by the gallant knights of the F.B.I. Then again Britain's financial position in the world has been showing signs of slight deterioration. The sterling exchange rate was unseasonably weak during January and early February, and the gold and dollar reserves of the Sterling Area showed no further tendency to rise after June, 1954. Mr. Butler has himself hinted that the boom in industry is causing Britain's import bill to rise too fast for comfort. The raising of the Bank Rate in January was a natural move for the Chancellor. Monetary policy was thereby used, firstly, in the hope that foreign funds would be attracted by an extra half-per cent. and so ease the pressure on the sterling exchange rate. Secondly, it was to serve as a mild check to speculative and inflationary tendencies visible in Britain's capitalist boom. Thirdly, it was thought that a tightening of monetary policy would make it easier to give tax concessions on Budget Day.

The Chancellor already has a substantial surplus of tax revenue over expenditure for the financial year now ending, although he originally budgeted for almost an exact balance. It is likely that the final surplus will turn out to be as high as £300 million, so he has some room for tax reductions. If, as is widely canvassed in the capitalist press, a sixpence is taken off the standard rate of income tax it will be profits and not wages which benefit. The prospect of a General Election makes it probable, however, that some sops will be thrown to the wage-earner and lower-paid salaried worker, perhaps in the form of an adjustment in the tax allowances for wife and children. But the changes in Purchase Tax, now announced before the Budget, are merely trivial this year. The economic strains set up by the capitalist boom can scarcely warrant in the Chancellor's eyes a major cut in taxation. But there is no doubt that Mr. Butler on this occasion will be seeing to it that business profits get the most benefit from any concessions he can make in his Budget. It is equally beyond doubt that any change of government will not of itself transform a Tory Budget for 1955 into a People's Budget for 1956 unless the new government drastically reduces military expenditure from its present prohibitive level and places the burden of taxation where it belongs—fairly and squarely on the backs of Big Business.

NEHRU AND COMMUNISM: 2

AJOY GHOSH

[The continuation of this important article by Ajoy Ghosh, general secretary of the Communist Party of India, appearing first in the weekly New Age of Delhi, deals with the internal situation in India, and is of particular interest in view of the elections in Andhra.—Ed., L.M.]

THE shift that has come over in Pandit Nehru's foreign policy in the last two years is not the result of an accident. It is due to the growing strength of the democratic world and in the first place to the exposure of the myth of American military might in the battlefields of Korea. Its fiasco not only upset the calculations of U.S. imperialists themselves, but showed Pandit Nehru also how wrong his earlier assessments had been. On December 7, 1950, six months after the outbreak of Korean war, he had remarked in Parliament: 'The democratic nations may win the war—mind you, I have little doubt that they will'. The failure of the American arms naturally helped to break the illusions of many, including Nehru, in the strength of the imperialist powers.

Secondly, these years have shown to all, particularly the Asian countries, that the threat to their freedom comes not from the democratic countries like China and U.S.S.R., but entirely from the imperialist countries. As early as January 1, 1949, Pandit Nehru himself had to refer to the treacherous attack of the Dutch on Indonesia:

We confess with sorrow that the attitude of some Western Powers has been one of tacit approval or acceptance of this aggression. There is a Western Union of which Holland is a member. What does that Union stand for? Money has flowed from the Western Union.

In the current year itself, two documents signed by two neighbouring countries reveal in a flash as to who is the enemy and who is the friend of free peoples of Asia. While Pakistan has signed the Arms Pact with U.S.A. selling off her sovereignty, India has signed the Chou-Nehru Declaration proclaiming the Five Principles guaranteeing peaceful co-existence on the basis of respect for the very sovereignty which America threatens to grab. And now with the Manila Treaty, the game is open and unashamed.

Thirdly, the tremendous growth of anti-British and anti-American sentiments in our people and the welling up of the urge for peace

and revulsion against war are factors of no mean significance. It is the democratic and peace movement in the country, in which the Communist Party also plays its part, which has helped to foster this urge, and it is Pandit Nehru's party and Government which have from time to time frowned upon it.

Nevertheless, it is this movement against war-mongering imperialists among our people which has contributed substantially in bringing about a shift in our foreign relations and making India a world power today. The fact of India becoming a world power is something about which every Indian is proud, the more so the Communists, for it has come along the path which they, at times single-handed, have fearlessly advocated. We, therefore, support this change and have no hesitation in recognising it. We trust that Pandit Nehru should also not hesitate to recognise this obvious change that has come over the very policy he directs.

Pandit Nehru has combined his praise for China with his attacks on the Indian Communists. Why is it so? To some extent it is the first shot in the coming election battle in Andhra. It is there that the corrupt, crisis-ridden Congress is facing a powerful challenge from the Communist Party. And as it is nearly time for Pandit Nehru to give tongue to his own Congressmen in Andhra, his latest vitriolics against the Communists might be setting the line that he wants his followers to take up in Andhra.

But that is not all. There is something more basic which makes Pandit Nehru launch this vicious attack on the Communist Party precisely at this time. The opening of the window into People's China and the closer liaison that is growing between India and the U.S.S.R. have revealed to our countrymen in growing numbers the phenomenal developments that have taken place in those countries, and is inevitably provoking in the minds of many of our people that question as to the path of development that we should follow in our own country, the social changes which alone constitute a firm basis for the uplifting of our country.

These new vistas have already startled the organs of Big Business, for they bring into relief the invidious contrast between the fast tempo of development in the once-backward China and the snail-speed progress in India accompanied by chronic suffering faced by millions. And it is through such appraisals that the people rapidly get a clear understanding of the correct path of development. The most conscious of them get increasingly drawn towards Socialism—towards the all-conquering ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin

—which alone point the way towards freedom, prosperity and happiness to the toiling masses. It is this dangerous development that Pandit Nehru wants to prevent. Hence it is that he combines his praise of China's achievements, which can no longer be denied, with denunciation of Marxism, which in his opinion is outmoded. That it is this very 'outmoded' Marxism which showed China how to overcome her age-old backwardness and grow into a mighty power with a rapidity which has amazed the whole world—this, he wants to make out, is a fact of no importance. As this argument becomes less and less convincing, louder and louder grows Pandit Nehru's denunciation of Marxism. Pandit Nehru has spoken in praise of the historic Long March of the Chinese Communists. But let it not be forgotten that it is precisely at the time of the very Long March that Chiang Kai-shek repeatedly attacked the Chinese Communists, branding them as bandits.

And this is the age-old tactics of all those who have to fight Communists and democrats. Ho Chi Minh, who could not but impress Pandit Nehru, was also dubbed a bandit by Bao Dai. And the Malayan Communists and patriots who are relentlessly fighting against British domination were denounced by Pandit Nehru himself in 1949. The Communists all over the world are used to this term of reproach, which their opponents hurl at them as they cannot crush them nor scare them into submission. Even in our national movement, it is the British Government and their stooges who used such terms of reproach against the Congress leaders themselves. So, when Pandit Nehru attacks us for indulging in violence, we do not think it necessary to go into any argument over it. The experience of these seven years since independence has proved to our countrymen who resorts to violence and who has to face it.

Propaganda in which Pandit Nehru has indulged this time too has tried to make out that the Indian Communists have no moorings among our people and they carry out the 'dictates of Russia and China'. It seems as if Pandit Nehru this time has been caught in the toils of his own propaganda: elated by the mighty ovation he received all over China and the friendly gestures from the Soviet Union in appreciation of his stand for peace, he seems to have almost come to believe that Indian Communists as a result would automatically come over to him, no matter what his policy is towards the masses of their own country. If Pandit Nehru has any such delusion, he is grievously mistaken. He should get rid of it once and for all.

The attitude of a Communist Party towards the Government of the country, or for the matter of that towards any party, is determined by the attitude of the Government towards the interests of the masses. And this is as much true of the Communist Party of India as of any other Communist Party in the world. Loyalty to the ideology of Marxism and loyalty to proletarian internationalism teaches us, as it teaches Communist Parties in other countries, (including the Communist Party of China that Pandit Nehru has praised) to be loyal to the masses of our own country, to serve them fearlessly, to oppose their oppressors and enemies. It is this test that impels us to stand by the millions of evicted kisans and thousands of workers threatened by rationalisation and to show them how to struggle for their very basic needs. It is this which brings them among the newly-astir ranks of the employees. Above all, it is this test that makes us supporters of the present shift in Nehru's foreign policy, and, at the same time, determined opponents of his Government, in the main, and the spearhead of the movement which strives to replace it by a Democratic Government. . . .

While Pandit Nehru gets our whole-hearted support for every one of his moves for peace and against imperialism, he has to realise that the praise he has got from the democratic masses all over the world is not for the Preventive Detention Act or the suppression of the peasantry—these might have won him bouquets in the U.S.A. and Britain—and it is precisely these very measures which the Communists also fight.

Further, the Communist Party realises that the capacity of a country to pursue a foreign policy vigorously along progressive direction depends on the strength of the economy, the condition of the masses and the extent of mass support a Government enjoys. It is precisely on these counts that Pandit Nehru's internal policy hampers, for it operates against the extension of democracy and does not improve the condition of the people. These shackles imposed on our masses—on the working class and peasantry—hit at precisely those very forces inside the country that alone can guarantee the carrying out of the mission of peace and democracy, and brings new succour to those very reactionary elements in our midst who are anxious to take India back to the imperialist tutelage.

Therefore, what is paraded as a paradox in a stand of support to the peaceful aspects of Pandit Nehru's foreign policy and relentless fight against the reactionary policies internally is nothing but a really consistent line of strengthening the forces of peace, freedom and democracy both at home and abroad. Pandit Nehru has complained

that China has unity while India lacks it. He should know why there is unity in China. Because the people there are united to sweep away the obstacles that stand in the path of China's advance towards the happiness of the masses, Chiang Kai-shek, despite his talk of unity, could not preserve it because he was anxious to preserve those very things which prevented the improvement of the lot of the people.

Today, inside Pandit Nehru's own party there is disunity and he has to run hither and thither to solve internal Congress crises. Let him ponder why it is so. The mass of the people cannot be united behind a policy which seeks to perpetuate the atrocious exploitation of the foreign and Indian vested interests. There can be no unity in the land if you keep up landlordism and suppress peasants' struggle. There can be no unity so long as monopolists go scot-free and British capitalists continue their loot, while you threaten workers with rationalisation.

Pandit Nehru is never tired of deriding the Communists for their alleged inconsistencies, for the contradictions in their position. If he thinks over the matter coolly he will see that it is he who is guilty of inconsistencies, it is his policy that is full of contradictions. He condemns the designs of U.S. imperialism but does not reject the aid whose avowed aim is furtherance of these very designs. He denounces the S.E.A.T.O. but refuses to break with British imperialism which is one of its main sponsors. He praises the achievements of the Chinese People's Republic but denounces the ideology which made these achievements possible. He takes a number of measures which help the cause of peace and freedom but pursues a national policy that weakens and shackles the very forces that are the true defenders of peace and freedom. These contradictions and inconsistencies, as the Communist Party has many times pointed out, are not accidental. They follow from the class character and class policy of Pandit Nehru's Government.

Pandit Nehru's denunciation of the Communist Party will not make us withdraw our support from those measures of his Government which go to strengthen the cause of peace and of Indian freedom. We shall not merely continue to support them but strive to build the broadest unity behind them and for their implementation. We know that these measures are the results of events and movements of world historic importance in bringing about and developing which we too, together with other patriots and democrats, have played our role. They are the result of the collective efforts of us all—of those who cherish freedom, democracy and

peace. Hence our duty and our task to further strengthen the unity of the people behind these measures, implement them and carry them forward. Nor will Pandit Nehru's denunciation of the Communist Party scare us to line up behind his Government whose policy in the main continues to be a policy against the interests of the people. Loyal to the cause of the masses, loyal to the ideology of Marxism and to the cause of peace, freedom and democracy, we of the Communist Party of India shall unflinchingly strengthen the movement of our people for freedom and peace, democracy and a better life. Ultimately it is the masses that shall decide.

December 2, 1954.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF BRITAIN

SANCHO PANZA

CLASS

One would think that there must be some reality behind all the talk of class. There must be some fire to account for the smoke.
—Carr-Saunders.

THE question of the existence or non-existence of social classes and especially the vexed question of the middle class has been a puzzling and perplexing problem of social theorists until the other day when it suddenly blossomed into news. This means that we can all discuss this question comfortably or vigorously, as suits our temperaments, and add to the confusion. The cat was put among the pigeons by Dr. Gilbert Murray, O.M. In a talk recently he firmly stated:

We have not only a middle class, but something very remarkable—a highly intelligent and competent middle class doing the government of the country. . . .

The proletariat cannot rule; it is too ignorant and incompetent. It would not be the proletariat if it were otherwise.

For quite a long time now Labour Party leaders and theorists have repeatedly assured us that they have done away with the ruling class and the working class and that we all now belong to the middle class. The working class had become a figment of imagination or a figure of speech much used at Labour Party conferences and meetings by the same leaders. The class question was thus practically settled until Dr. Murray unsettled it again to the great delight of the *Daily Telegraph*:

So seldom is the middle class seriously and publicly patted on the back that when it happens it is news. . . . The fact is that this kind of tribute

is most warmly appreciated when it comes from those who have been in their time reformers, perhaps even rebels against bourgeois virtues and limitations.

In vain did the *Daily Herald* try to reassure us:

Class. Now there's no such thing. . . . We have all become middle class. . . . It (class) means differences of social behaviour. And these are getting less every day. Fifty years ago you could tell what class a man belonged to by the hat he wore. . . . We all think alike. We all watch television, from the Royal family downwards. . . . Class has disappeared.

So the class question is wide open again. There are many things that puzzle us. How, if there are no classes, can we become middle class? Doesn't 'middle' mean middle of something or other? How can we go out for the middle class vote if there are no classes? and if we already belong to the middle class? Doesn't 'downwards' from Royalty mean stages or classes? All this ought to be sorted out.

I think the trouble with the Labour Party leaders and the *Daily Herald* is that they confuse the aim with reality. The aim as given by their spiritual fathers, the Fabians, is a sort of middle-class paradise where classes are not sharply marked. That is, a promiscuous society where duchesses rub shoulders or play golf and afterwards lunch not only with doctors' wives, but dairymaids and charwomen (Shaw). We haven't reached this stage yet.

CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS

A deep division is disturbing the nation's sub-consciousness.—*The Times*.

In his classic work on the 'Social Structure of Britain', Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders assures us that:

The belief in the existence of social classes, or even of one social class, the interests of the members of which are identical, or nearly so . . . is the result of studying social theory of doubtful value.

Having presumably studied a 'social theory of doubtful value', the ruling class, whether in the good old times or the present day, whether they belonged to the aristocracy or merely to the rich, has never had any difficulty in recognising its existence or its place in society. They have always been class-conscious and concerned with their class interests. This applies also to the organised workers. The difficulties about class have arisen only in the middle-class mind to whatever class-body it belongs. Not to be out-done by the ruling class and the working class in this matter of class-consciousness, and convinced that class is anyway only a psychological manifestation, the middle class has recently decided to have a 'middle-class-consciousness as a reaction against the working class' (Dr. Bonham).

What, then, is the social picture of Britain today as seen through

political eyes? According to the *Daily Herald* which represents the Labour Party, there exists only one class, the middle class to which we all belong. According to the *Daily Telegraph* which represents the Conservative Party there are three classes—‘those who run things’, the ‘N.C.O.’s of those who run things, ‘the teachers, farmers, trade union officials, business men and similar people’, and the working class. According to Dr. Bonham (of the ‘Middle Class Vote’ book) there are two classes—the working class and those ‘whatever their income, who reject the idea of being working class’.

THE VEXED QUESTION OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

Oh, to be the wife of a boilermaker who can stand up and roar his head off whenever he likes!—*Manchester Guardian*.
(Letter from a bank clerk's wife.)

The vexed and confusing question of the middle class was very much to the fore in the nineteen-thirties when the middle class was caught in the economic blizzard. It did not know where to turn and which way to escape from the middle, although we all tried to help it. But the problem was never solved because we were overtaken by the war which has a habit of masking class frontiers. The war and after-war years did something to the middle class as evidenced by Dr. Murray, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Daily Herald*.

From what has been said up to now we can be fairly sure that the middle class exists. It has been defined by one of their own social theorists as

an heterogeneous assemblage of very diverse and non-cohesive elements. The difficulty is how to recognise it as it is lacking any marked characteristics. Very diverse views have been put forward how the middle class can be identified. The identification marks include clothes, hats, manners, general behaviour, accent and other such things. The *Daily Telegraph* has given us the most fascinating clue. According to the article quoted before, the middle class can be identified by its ‘middleness’, its ‘role as a cushion’ and ‘its value as a filter’. Whatever we may say about the middle class there is no doubt that it is some kind of a swaying and leaning body which has a soul and a vote. Everybody knows or should know that our two alternating Government Parties are vigorously fighting for the soul and the vote of the middle class. This is strongly resented by the remains of the Liberal Party which claims to be the cohesive element of the middle class although one of the tenets of its creed is ‘not to be identified with any class or special interest’. You see what I mean when I say that there is a lot of confusion.

HOW TO MAKE US ALL MIDDLE CLASS

As in so many social problems the economic factors, because they are tangible and easy to formulate, create a screen which masks subtler psychological preoccupations.—*The Times*.

When the Labour Party took over from the Liberals the second place in the two party system of government it also took over many tenets from the Liberal creed, among them the following in relation to class:

To be the enemy of all purely class interests and of all sharply marked distinctions of class or caste. To destroy, not foster class-consciousness, and to substitute for it community consciousness and the community spirit.

—(*Ramsay Muir*.)

The class-consciousness which ought to be destroyed is, of course, the workers' class-consciousness and the community referred to is the middle-class community or the promiscuous society previously mentioned. The problem is how to make us all middle class, because there still are so many of us who stubbornly cling to the time-honoured title of the worker. This business of making us all middle class occupies the attention not only of the Labour Party leaders, but also of a lot of other social reformers. The question loomed large in the war-time discussion of post-war problems. A flood of suggestions came forward from all the reform committees of the political parties, industrialists, newspaper letter writers and various kinds of individual social reformers. They all agreed that money is not the root of the trouble, but psychology. What was necessary was a new social assessment of the worker and a change in his clothes. There must be no 'social disparagement of the worker'. 'We must not look down on the worker.' 'We must cease to call the workers hands or labour supply.' 'Why not call them employees?' Etc., etc. The psychological impact of clothes was well put by *The Times*:

For the man or woman whose work cannot be clean, a change of clothes should be arranged inside the works so that his appearance as he enters or leaves should suggest no difference between him and the clerk or draughtsman.

The difference in the uniform of the owners, directors or managers isn't of any consequence as the concern is to make us middle class. The question of clothes reminds me of a pre-war pathetic story how a youth's attempt to join the middle class was foiled by a pair of second-hand apple-green trousers, as his working-class parents were unable to supply him with middle-class trousers.

There remains the question of our manners; but these can be easily learned by listening to the B.B.C., looking at the television or

frequenting cinemas. If anyone would wish to take a glimpse of our future middle-class community they have only to switch on their radio to Mrs. Dale's Diary. There you will find businessmen, doctors, lawyers, charwomen, farmers, financiers, spivs, clergymen, teachers, gentlemen's gentlemen, secretaries, writers, military men, shop assistants, film stars, actresses, shopkeepers, gardeners, rentiers, publishers, etc. They all live happily together and are kind to the poor and unfortunate.

'WE' AND 'THEY'

The gulf that exists between 'we' and 'they' is in truth alarming.—Harold Nicholson.

Thinking it all over and having weighed all the pros and cons I have come to the conclusion that it is best to stick to the only realistic, clear and simple popular conception of our social structure which divides us into 'we' and 'they' and you cannot go wrong. Everybody knows who 'we' are and who 'they' are. The solidity of this opinion about our social structure is confirmed by the fact that it never wavered even under the Labour Government when socialism was established and the ruling class was abolished. There is indeed a deep gulf between 'we' and 'they'. We are 'we' and they are 'they' and the two will never meet in a friendly fashion inside a middle class.

STALIN'S LEGACY AND BRITAIN

WILLIAM GALLACHER

THERE is not the slightest doubt that a powerful group of war-maniacs in the U.S.A. are deliberately conspiring to drive America, regardless of the will of the people, into war and if possible to drag Britain and other countries into the maelstrom. Eden and the rest, representing British ruling-class circles, don't like the way things are going, but what can they do? History has got them into a trap. America now occupies and dominates great areas of the world where the British were for so long top dogs. Yet while steadily liquidating the British Empire, America at the same time stands out as the great champion of capitalism, the powerful force that keeps capitalism going in Western Europe. So despite the bitter struggle 'behind the scenes' they must still cling to the dollar-merchants and keep up the pretence of 'our great allies'.

In the midst of all this threat of war and the terrible disaster it could bring upon the world, the most active people in helping to

make the workers of this country the 'war-allies' of the American and British monopoly capitalists, have been leaders of the Labour Party. Notorious in this respect has been their simply frantic support of German rearmament. Yet if the Labour movement in this country had taken a stand, as it ought to have done, against German rearmament, the whole conspiracy would have been defeated at the outset and the present crisis in the straits of Formosa would not have developed. For this dangerous situation, the blame rests squarely on the right-wing Labour leaders and to an extent on the 'Lefts'.

The politicians of capitalism, Churchill, Eden and Co. and their masters, act according to their own class interests as do the American imperialists. But the right-wing Labour leaders act against the interests of the working class they are supposed to represent. But they still command a large following throughout the country. Even those members of the Labour Party who are strongly opposed to them on German rearmament will often make excuses for them and say that while they may be wrong on this or that issue, they are all right on others. This confusion, so prevalent among our people, the failure to see policy as a whole and the necessity of exposing and fighting out differences, makes the tasks of the Communists doubly hard. How opportune, therefore, in the situation that now confronts us, is the ninth volume of Stalin's *Collected Works*.^{*} As I read the speeches and letters that make up the volume, I continually got the feeling that he was writing or speaking of present-day events. It is truly amazing. True, he's dealing with the opposition during the difficult days of 1926-27. What an exposure! What a telling exposure he makes of Trotsky and his associates. No wonder the Trotskyites hated him. The task before the workers of the Soviet Union at that period was the building of socialism. The opposition said it couldn't be done. They babbled of the stabilising and the strength of capitalism and the hopeless economic position of the Soviet Union. Here is how Stalin put the issue to the Party and the workers:

Thus you have before you two forces. On the one hand, you have our Party, which is confidently leading the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. forward, building socialism and summoning the proletariat of all countries to the struggle. On the other hand, you have the opposition, hobbling along behind our Party like a decrepit old man with rheumatic legs, an aching back and a pain the head—an opposition that sows pessimism around it and poisons the atmosphere with its twaddle to the effect that nothing will

^{*}J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. IX (392 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. 5s.).

come of socialism in the U.S.S.R., that over there, among the bourgeois everything is all right, and that over here, among the proletarians, everything is all wrong.

These, comrades, are the two forces confronting you. It is for you to make your choice between them (Laughter). (Page 154.)

There you have clearly exposed, the attitude of our present-day Labour leaders. Everything in the bourgeois garden is lovely, everything in the proletarian country, the land of socialism, is all wrong. Shocking, horribly shocking, that Morrison should present the ruthless monopoly capitalists of America as 'progressive' while being venomous against the Soviet Union.

Earlier, Stalin deals with imperialism:

The fundamental error of the opposition is that it does not or will not, understand the vast difference between pre-imperialist capitalism and imperialist capitalism, that it does not understand the economic essence of imperialism and confuses two different phases of capitalism. . . . From this error springs another error of the opposition, which is that it does not understand the meaning and importance of the law of uneven development in the period of imperialism. (Page 105.)

He then poses the question of the difference and presents it in a way that will repay close consideration. I wish we could get every active member of the Labour Party and the trade unions to make a study of this and what follows in the subsequent pages. What is the difference?

It is that the development of capitalism through free competition has been replaced by development through huge monopolist capitalist combines; that the old 'cultured' 'progressive' capital has been replaced by finance capital, 'decaying' capital; that the 'peaceful' expansion of capital and its spread to 'vacant' territories has been replaced by spasmodic development, development through redivisions of the already divided world by means of military conflicts between the capitalist groups: that the old capitalism, the development of which as a whole was on the upgrade, has been replaced by a moribund capitalism, the development of which as a whole is on the downgrade. (Page 106.)

On page 113, read this:

The world imperialist war (*First World War, W.G.*) was the first attempt to redivide the already divided world. That attempt cost capitalism the victory of the revolution in Russia and the undermining of imperialism in the colonies and dependencies.

It goes without saying that the first attempt at redivision is bound to be followed by a second attempt, preparations for which are already under way in the imperialist camp.

It is scarcely to be doubted that a second attempt will cost world capitalism much dearer than the first.

The second attempt came. German capital wanted colonies and 'Lebensraum'. Room for investment and exploitation as well as

markets and raw materials. The 'cost' has shaken imperialism to its foundations. And now the new brutal imperialist power America seeks to redivide the world, not in the interests of Britain or any of the N.A.T.O. powers, but in the interest of American monopoly capitalism alone. There is so much more I'd like to quote on this subject of imperialism and uneven development, but I hope every reader of the *Labour Monthly* will read this volume and give it the careful study it deserves. I wish I could get the 'Lefts' in the parliamentary Labour Party to apply themselves to it. I'd be willing to raise the money to provide them with free copies.

I must confine myself to two more quotations—one from a really penetrating examination of the 'Chinese question'. Consider this in relation to what is happening today:

It is possible that when the imperialists bombarded Nanking they wanted to intimidate the oppressed peoples of other countries who are straining for liberty, as though to say, the Nanking affair is meant for your benefit. . . .

That the imperialists do not want a united China and prefer to have two Chinas in order to be able to 'manoeuvre more effectively' has been blurted out by the capitalist press more than once. (Page 203.)

But now with Chiang Kai-shek and his 'fake' government on Formosa, it is openly seen by all.

And now especially for the Labour Party readers. Stalin is discussing the struggle going on in the Bolshevik Party. He says on page 4:

Either one set of principles or another must be made the basis of the Party's work. A 'middle' line in matters of principle is the 'line' of stuffing people's heads with rubbish.

How do the social-democratic parties of the West exist and develop nowadays? Have they inner-party contradictions, disagreements based on principle? Of course they have. Do they disclose these contradictions and try to overcome them openly and honestly in the sight of the party membership? No, of course not.

There is the root cause of the appalling rot in the parliamentary Labour Party. The 'Left' are afraid to come out, 'openly and honestly' before the workers, and thereby they leave the field to the right-wing leaders and the rubbish, the capitalist rubbish, they try to stuff into the heads of members. What better example could be given than Bevan sitting silent at the Labour Party conference during the most critical discussion—German rearmament—and allowing the right wing to get away with a shabby, shoddy trick. This is a truly great volume. There is a wealth of education in it. I hope every reader takes full advantage of it.

COLONIAL POLICY

(Resolution adopted at the Annual General Meeting of the Union of Democratic Control, London, December 4, 1954.)

1. This Annual General Meeting of the Union of Democratic Control declares its solidarity with the colonial peoples who are struggling for the rights of self-determination and of human equality. It condemns the policies pursued by the British Government in denial of these rights in general, and in particular in Kenya and Malaya, where wars still proceed, though the Geneva Conference was acclaimed as having ended wars in the world.

2. This Annual General Meeting calls for the opening of negotiations in Kenya. These negotiations should be based on a definite understanding that acts committed by either side during the so-called 'Emergency' shall be deemed not to have been crimes, and that, as in the case of a Strike terminated by negotiation, there shall be no victimisation. They should be opened, on the British side, by the sending of two intermediaries, of whom one should be an African, to establish contact with the insurgents with a view to arranging, firstly, a cease-fire, and secondly, a round-table conference, at which the Africans, the Asians, and the Europeans would be equally represented. It should be understood beforehand, moreover, that the object of this round-table conference shall be the negotiation of an agreement of the terms on which self-determination shall be swiftly accorded to Kenya on a definite date, and that those terms shall be such as will ensure full and equal rights to the Africans, who constitute the majority of the population. In the meanwhile, steps should be taken immediately to set

at liberty the 50,000 Africans who are now in prison or in detention camps as a result of arrest under Emergency laws.

3. In Malaya also, hostilities should be brought to an end without delay by the negotiation of an armistice. The Emergency Regulations should be revoked forthwith, as an essential prelude to the opening of negotiations for a settlement under which provision shall be made for elections covering Malaya as a whole (including Singapore) to a fully-elected Assembly. These elections should be conducted on a basis of universal adult suffrage, and it should be understood beforehand that the Assembly thus elected shall have

Where do ideas come from ?

Do different classes have different ideas? How do they form them? What are the ideas of Socialism? These are some of the questions discussed in *The Role of Advanced Ideas in the Development of Society*, a new booklet just arrived in this country from the Soviet Union. It costs 1/- (plus 4d. postage).

Order it from any bookseller today or send direct to

COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS

(Dept. V), 45, Museum St., London, W.C.1.

transferred to it without delay on a definite date full powers of sovereignty and self-determination.

4. In conclusion, this Annual General Meeting calls on the Labour Party to adopt immediately an attitude towards the colonial people which is in accordance with its Socialist principles, and, above all and in particular, to declare publicly forthwith its conviction that the accordance of full self-determination to all these peoples is not only in their best interest, but also in the best interest of the British people. The Labour Party should declare that, as soon as it regains power in Britain, it will grant full sovereignty and self-determination to the colonial peoples, and should proceed now to the drafting of detailed plans for so doing, and for the speedy development of trade, on a revised basis in accordance with the changed circumstances, between Britain and the liberated territories. Such development is as urgently necessary for the prosperity of the British people as it is for that of the colonial peoples, and is probably more indispensable for the former than for the latter.

Book Reviews

KASHMIR

Anglo-American Plot Against Kashmir, by Vijay Kumar. (216 pp. People's Publishing House, Bombay; Collet's, 7s. 6d.)

TO what desperate lengths the U.S.A. is prepared to go to establish its domination over Southern Asia is now widely realised. This book shows in detail how the U.S. have pursued this aim in one vital part of this region. Through a maze of successive schemes the aim has been the subordination of Kashmir to im-

perialist control, whether through the installing for an indefinite period of a United Nations (*read* U.S.) administration or by other methods. The book reveals some features of imperialist diplomatic and intelligence methods. Particularly worth studying is the devastating account (in chapters XI and XII) of the operations of the U.N. Commission in India and Pakistan in 1949-50—a story almost completely unknown in this country. It is clear that the dramatic action of the governments of India and Kashmir in August, 1953 was a signal victory for the forces of peace—a victory since consolidated by the removal of the U.N. 'observers' from the State. The virtues of full documentation, lucidity, and conciseness are combined throughout. **EDWARD BURTON**

BRITISH GUIANA

What Happened In British Guiana, by Cheddi Jagan, with foreword by Jennie Lee, M.P. (16 pp. Union of Democratic Control. 6d.)

IN October, 1953, the Constitution of British Guiana was summarily suspended. A Government White Paper charged the Prime Minister, Dr. Jagan, and other leaders of the People's Progressive Party with mal-administration and alleged a plot to set fire to public buildings. Dr. Jagan here describes the economy of British Guiana—in the grip of the sugar monopolies—the condition of the people, the state of education and social services, trade union organisation and the constitutional changes which gave in April, 1953, the first general election based on universal adult suffrage: the background to this betrayal of democratic rights.

B.M.B.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

that the sense of outrage in the Labour Parties (which then efforts were made to conceal) was early disclosed—and stimulated—by our printing in May *Labour Parties Protest*. Suppose these articles, with those by R. W. Casasola, Gordon Schaffer, Quaestor and others had been read, not by tens, but by scores, of thousands in Britain. How much quicker and more far-reaching would have been the transformation of the outlook of, say, the colliery electrician, to whom an *East Midlands* friend asks us to send the February issue: '*Until only recently he was a Conservative; this is just what he needs, the working class outlook, as he is extremely perturbed over re-arming Germany and the Formosa business*'. From territory which knew German occupation, a *Channel Islander* writes: '*What a lovely afternoon! I have read every word of the February L.M. and it is a beauty.*

Then, at 6 p.m. the news of Soviet scientific progress, in answer to the threats. Here's a thank-offering of £1. Yours, in justified optimism'.

When the Nehru article appeared in the February issue, an Indian student asked us to send it at once to two English friends in *Oxford*. Such enthusiastic circulation-raisers clearly spend much thought on what will be the best way to win new readers, either by our Midget or a specimen copy. Thus, a Londoner writes to a young friend: '*I have asked them to send you this January copy and I want you to read it from cover to cover. It's a sure guide to the most important things you most ardently desire—Socialism in our time. It's the best one-and-sixpenny worth on the labour question in the whole world. When you've read it, and put in a regular order, pass it round*'. Sound advice!

January donations totalled:

£53 17s. 10d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'English Observer', standing-in for Guatemala, 'in memory of Thomas Jefferson', 1s.; 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy, 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.

STEADY MONEY came from: 'New York', £1 4s. 6d.; Anon, 'Whitechurch', 1s.; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; P.O.H., 'Dublin' (pre-paid); 'Socialist Sailor', £1; 'Personal Greetings from U.S.A.', £3; G. Bell, 5s.; 'Karin, Konrad and Thorsten', 15s.; 'Tam O'Shanter, Grey Mare and Foal' (pre-paid); M. Philibert (pre-paid); Q. Elliot, 6s.; H.G.B., 2s.; J.C., £19 2s.; D. Rees, 2s.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; D. H. Strathern, 2s.; T. Flood, 2s. 6d.; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s.; L'Humanité, 3s.; T.W.R., £1; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; R. McLeod, 5s.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; S. Morrissey, 10s.; 'D.F.O.', 6s.; Olivia Greene, £2; E.J.B., 10s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: G. Dowling, 10s.; D. Macdonald, 6d.; A. Buirski, 1s.; M.F. (Italy), 2s.; W. Blanchard, 2s.; P. H. Plumb, £1 2s.; J. A. Fraser, 7s. 6d.; D. Spencer, 2s.; W. Gregory, 2s.; M. Hurwitt, 2s.; J. Gray, 2s.; D. Lewis, 11s. 6d.; K. Millward, 2s. 6d.; Brent Independent Marxists, 3s. 4d.; J. Bacon, 3s.; F. P. Foulkes, 2s.; H. Fomison, £1; L. Barnes, £1 2s.; L. Solomons, 5s.; T. Brownlie, 2s.; J. MacQueen, 7s.; J. McCallum, £1; A. E. Giebler, 2s.; H. Syder, 3s. 6d.; L. Shapiro, 12s.; H. Stringer, 2s.; A. Ramage, 11s. 6d.; M. Hall, £1; S. Harrison, 2s.; S. H. Moore, 2s.; T. Powell, 2s.; L. J. Thatcher, 2s.; A. Johnstone, 1s.; B.R. (N.Z.), 1s.; C.M.F., 9s. 6d.; E. Winstanley, 2s.; C. Moss, £1 5s.; B. Farrington, 7s.; J. Anderson, 1s.; D. F. M. Parvin, 10s.; T. Chapman, 1s.; G. J. Davies, 1s.; H. L. Merrion, 5s.; C. E. Mason, 2s.; C. Windley, 11s.; A. W. Elliott, 2s.; J. Wyatt, 2s.; R. Weare, 7s.; D. Smith, 5s.; E. R. Chaplin, 5s.; R. F. Gillett, 1s.; F. Wignall, 2s.; S. Harcombe, 2s.; H. M. Gluckman, 6s.; J. A. Edwards, 12s.; A. J. S. Salmon, 1s.; J. Besserman, 2s.; R.B. (U.S.A.), 10s. 6d.; T.K.H. (U.S.A.), 7s.; H.A.M. (U.S.A.), 10s. 6d.; H.Z. (U.S.A.), £2 5s. 6d.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT,

Co-op. No. L99482.

134. Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WHY NOT BY POST ?

Here's the Subscription Form:

NAME
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS
.....
.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 18s. (home) \$3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada). 19s. (elsewhere) for a year, beginning with the.....issue.

(SIGNED)

TO LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

March issue includes:

"Railway Investment Plan"
"West German View on Arms"
Economic Supplement
Monthly 9d. p.a. 10s. 6d.

**LABOUR RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT**
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the
American progressive
movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription, 34s. 6d.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1

FOR THE MIDGET

Send a Midget Labour Monthly with the 4-months-for-3 trial sub. to:—

Name

Address

Mention that I could book the order through my usual agent (*delete if inapplicable*)

I enclose 3d.
towards cost

Signed.....

Address.....

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy of the issue to:—

(1) Name

Address

(2) Name

Address

You may mention my name,
or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed

Address

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3